

To: Eaton, Thomas[Eaton.Thomas@epa.gov]; Henszey, Jo[Henszey.Jo@epa.gov]; Croxton, Dave[Croxton.David@epa.gov]
From: Mann, Laurie
Sent: Wed 3/19/2014 7:18:25 PM
Subject: RE: Budd / Deschutes TMDL

Tom & Jo,

I recommend that Jo talk to both Ben Cope and Mindy (perhaps in that order) in order to get their take on the marine studies. I know Ben has been involved in those studies, but I don't know what level of funding EPA has provided (via the Puget Sound Team, I assume). Ben will know (or will know who knows). Having sat through two of Mindy's presentations, I do believe that there is quite a bit of uncertainty about the degree and location of impairments in marine waters, so I can understand Ecology's hesitation there. The issue of Capitol Lake, however, seems different in nature.

Talking with the Squaxin Tribe is a good idea. Normally we "consult" on activities where EPA is taking an action, and in this case I would argue that EPA no obligation to officially "consult" with the Tribe, since EPA doesn't have an official role in deciding what waters will be addressed in the Deschutes TMDL. Checking in with the Tribe to make sure they understand what Ecology is contemplating and why, and to understand the Tribes underlying interests, however, is important. Hopefully the tribe is actively participating in the watershed group.

If the Freshwater TMDL is submitted this summer, Jo's role would be take the lead on tribal consultation (draft the letter & talk with tribe), review the draft TMDL (with support from one of us in Seattle) and write up the approval (with support from Seattle), and be the overall EPA contact on the project for external parties. This is a complicated project, so we appreciate Jo's help and realize that she will need our support too.

Thanks,

Laurie

From: Eaton, Thomas
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2014 12:03 PM
To: Mann, Laurie; Henszey, Jo; Croxton, Dave
Subject: RE: Budd / Deschutes TMDL

Thanks Laurie,

Jo and I just met to discuss the project and she will be collecting some follow up information. Too bad Dave R. didn't leave any files on the project as it has over 10 years of history and a lot of investment by EPA over that period.

I asked Jo to check on the follow up studies recommended for the marine portion of the TMDL, particularly from a grant management standpoint. Are we funding the studies and do we agree that they are needed to complete the TMDL?

In anticipation that the Squaxin Tribe may take the position that there is enough info to complete the entire TMDL now, I asked Jo to contact the Tribal rep (also a new person) and to discuss with you the typical way we engage with Tribes that have a significant interest in a TMDL.. If the Tribe requests consultation on the decision to split or not, how would we proceed?

Assuming that Ecology does proceed to split the TMDL and submits the freshwater TMDL this summer, what is Jo's role? It also seemed like we might be able to disengage for a couple of years after approval of the freshwater TMDL as Ecology would be doing marine studies for a couple of years.

Thomas Eaton

Director, Washington Operations Office

USEPA, Region 10

360-753-8086

206-295-9364 (cell)

From: Mann, Laurie

Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2014 9:39 AM

To: Henszey, Jo; Croxton, Dave

Cc: Eaton, Thomas

Subject: RE: Budd / Deschutes TMDL

Hi Jo (and Tom),

I understand that the impairments to be addressed in the Deschutes TMDL include bacteria, temperature, DO, pH and sediment. In order to address DO (and perhaps pH), Ecology will probably use targets such as CBOD, TP, ammonia and perhaps Nitrogen. My only concern / question about splitting the TMDL into a freshwater / marine portion is that the loading of CBOD, TP, ammonia and nitrogen needed to meet the DO standards in the freshwater may not result in meeting standards downstream (especially if the “divide” is upstream of Capitol Lake).

So it seems to me that Ecology would need to be very upfront about the possibility that allocations developed for the freshwater portion may need to be changed in the future to address the marine portion. If I knew more about the project I could provide more specific feedback. Jo and Tom, if you think that “we” need to be more involved in this project (e.g. getting Ben Cope’s support or feedback), let me know & we can hopefully arrange that.

Thanks,

Laurie

From: Henszey, Jo
Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2014 1:18 PM
To: Mann, Laurie; Croxton, Dave
Cc: Eaton, Thomas
Subject: FW: Budd / Deschutes TMDL

Hi folks,

Please see Andrew’s email below. I think a few of us have “opinions” regarding Ecology’s impending decision to split or not split this TMDL, however, I would like to know if we have “official input” on this.

Thanks,

Jo

From: Kolosseus, Andrew (ECY) [<mailto:AKOL461@ECY.WA.GOV>]
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 11:43 AM
To: Henszey, Jo
Cc: Wagner, Lydia (ECY)
Subject: Budd / Deschutes TMDL

Jo:

Good morning. A while back we talked with you about splitting the Budd/Deschutes TMDL into a freshwater TMDL and marine water TMDL. We're getting ready to make a decision, and we wanted to know if EPA has any official input.

The two main options are to (a) split it - complete a freshwater TMDL now and the marine TMDL in a couple years after we complete more technical work or (b) keep it together - complete a joint TMDL in a couple of years. (The answer everyone always wants – complete everything now – isn't feasible; we have more technical work we need to do on the marine side).

We're going to have a meeting about this in a couple weeks, so if you have any EPA input, that would be great to hear soon.

Thanks.

Andrew Kolosseus
Washington State Dept. of Ecology
PO Box 47775
Olympia, WA 98504-7775
(360) 407-7543

